



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/315,795	05/21/1999	AMIR WEINBERG	MERCURY.1CP1	6943

7590

09/24/2002

KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP
620 NEWPORT CENTER DR
16TH FLR
NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92660

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, THU HA T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED: 09/24/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/315,795

Applicant(s)

WEINBERG ET AL.

Examiner

Thu Ha T. Nguyen

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 July 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 28-70 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 28-70 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims **28- 70** are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

2. In view of Applicants' argument in the Appeal Brief filed on July 26, 2002, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of rejections are set forth below. The appeal brief fee may be applied to a future appeal in this application (if any).

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2155

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

4. Claims 28-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by **Ball et al.**, (hereinafter Ball) U.S. Patent No. **6,366,933**.

5. As to claim 28, **Ball** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including a computer-implemented method for facilitating the management of a web site, comprising:

scanning the web site to generate a first data structure which represents the web site at a first point in time, wherein the web site comprises a collection of inter-linked hypertextual documents (abstract, col. 1 lines 51-57, col. 6 lines 45-54);

subsequently, after changes have been made to the web site, scanning the web site to generate a second data structure which represents the web site at a second point in time (abstract, col. 3 lines 23-35, col. 4 lines 4-67),

comparing the first data structure to the second data structure to identify modifications that were made to the web site between the first and the second points in time (abstract, col. 1 lines 51-57, col. 3 lines 29-35, col. 4 lines 30-40, col. 10 lines 38, col. 11 lines 15-27); and

generating a graphical map in which at least some of the modifications are represented (figures 3-5, 11-13, col. 2 lines 23-35, col. 5 lines 4-40, col. 9 lines 20-26, col. 10 lines 25-38).

6. As to claim 29, **Ball** teaches the step of generating the graphical map comprises displaying at least one of the following types of objects in a distinct color: new nodes, new links, modified nodes, deleted nodes, and deleted links (figures 3-4, col. 5 lines 4-40). In addition, **Ball** explained more detail and function of HTMLDIFF in the Fifth International World Wide Web Conference on May 6-10, 1996, Paris, France to support HTMLDIFF of this invention as shown in section 4, figure 4, to provide users with the ability to see both insertion and deletion of web pages.

7. As to claim 30, **Ball** teaches the step of generating the graphical map comprises presenting a user an option to specify types of modifications to be displayed within the map (col. 9 lines 8-col. 10 lines 38).

8. As to claim 31, **Ball** teaches the graphical map includes icons that represent modified web pages, and the method further comprises responding to user

selection of an icon that represents a modified web page by displaying the modified web page (figures 3, 11, col. 4 lines 40-67, col. 17 lines 14-65).

9. As to claim 32, **Ball** teaches the step of generating the graphical map comprises using a layout algorithm to position graphical representations of nodes and links of the web site on a display screen (figures 3-4, col. 5 lines 4-40. In addition, **Ball** explained more detail and function of HTMLDIFF in the Fifth International World Wide Web Conference on May 6-10, 1996, Paris, France to support HTMLDIFF of this invention as shown in section 4, figure 4).

10. As to claim 33, **Ball** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, further comprising automatically sending to a user an email message which lists at least some of the modifications (figure 6, col. 7 lines 4-15, col. 11 lines 50-col. 12 lines 9).

11. As to claim 34, **Ball** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the web site is scanned and the first and second data structures compared automatically according to a pre-specified schedule (col. 12 lines 10-55).

12. As to claim 35, **Ball** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein scanning the web site comprises storing attributes which indicate dates and times of last modification of content objects of the web site, and comparing the first and

second data structures comprises comparing the attributes of like content objects to identify content objects that have been modified (figures, 3, 5, 7).

13. As to claim 36, **Ball** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including a computer-implemented method for facilitating the analysis of a web comprising:

comparing the web site at a first point in time to the web site at a second point in time to identify modifications made to the web site between the first and second points in time, wherein the web site comprises a collection of hypertextual documents interconnected by one or more links (abstract, col. 1 lines 51-57, col. 3 lines 23-35, col. 4 lines 4-67, col. 6 lines 45-54, col. 10 lines 38, col. 11 lines 15-27).

generating a graphical map in which at least some of the modifications to the web site are highlighted (figures 3-5, 11-13, col. 2 lines 23-35, col. 5 lines 4-40, col. 9 lines 20-26, col. 10 lines 25-38).

14. As to claim 45, **Ball** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including a computer-readable medium having stored thereon a computer program, the computer program comprising:

a scanning module which scans a web site to generate a representation of the web site, the representation specifying at least an arrangement of nodes and links of the web site (abstract, col. 1 lines 51-57, col. 3 lines 23-35, col. 4 lines 4-67, col. 6 lines 45-54),

a comparison module which compares representations of the web site generated by the scanning module at different times to identify modifications made to the web site (abstract, col. 1 lines 51-57, col. 3 lines 29-35, col. 4 lines 30-40, col. 10 lines 38, col. 11 lines 15-27).

a mapping module which generates a graphical site map in which at least some of the modifications are highlighted (figures 3-5, 11-13, col. 2 lines 23-35, col. 5 lines 4-40, col. 9 lines 20-26, col. 10 lines 25-38).

15. As to claim 53, **Ball** teaches wherein the graphical map comprises representations of a plurality of nodes of the web site (figures 3-4, col. 5 lines 4-40. In addition, **Ball** explained more detail and function of HTMLDIFF in the Fifth International World Wide Web Conference on May 6-10, 1996, Paris, France to support HTMLDIFF of this invention as shown in section 4, figure 4).

16. As to claim 54, **Ball** teaches wherein the graphical map further comprises representations of plurality of links of the web site (figures 3-4, col. 5 lines 4-40. In addition, **Ball** explained more detail and function of HTMLDIFF in the Fifth International World Wide Web Conference on May 6-10, 1996, Paris, France to support HTMLDIFF of this invention as shown in section 4, figure 4).

17. As to claim 55, **Ball** teaches the step of generating a graphical map (figures 3-4, col. 5 lines 4-40).

18. As to claim 56, **Ball** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including a computer program capable of performing the method of claim 28 (col. 4 lines 29-40, col. 5 lines 4-40).

19. As to claim 63, **Ball** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including a computer-implemented method for facilitating the management of the web site, comprising:

scanning the web site to generate a first data structure that includes representations of a plurality of nodes and links of the web site at a first point in time (abstract, col. 1 lines 51-57, col. 6 lines 45-54);

subsequently, after changes have been made to the web site, scanning the web site to generate a second data structure that includes representations of a plurality of nodes and links of the web site at a second point in time (abstract, col. 3 lines 23-35, col. 4 lines 4-67),

comparing the first data structure to the second data structure to identify changes made to the web site between the first and the second points in time (abstract, col. 1 lines 51-57, col. 3 lines 29-35, col. 4 lines 30-40, col. 10 lines 38, col. 11 lines 15-27).

generating a graphical map that depicts at least some of the changes, the graphical map including graphical representations of at least one of the following: (a)

Art Unit: 2155

nodes that were added to the web site between first and second points in time; (b) links that were added to the web site between first and second points in time; (c) nodes that were deleted from the web site between the first and second points in time; (d) links that were deleted from the web site between the first and second points in time; and (e) nodes of the web site that were modified between the first and second points in time (figures 3-5, 11-13, col. 2 lines 23-35, col. 5 lines 4-40, col. 9 lines 20-26, col. 10 lines 25-38). In addition, **Ball** explained more detail and function of HTMLDIFF in the Fifth International World Wide Web Conference on May 6-10, 1996, Paris, France to support HTMLDIFF of this invention as shown in section 4, figure 4, to provide users with the ability to see the graph of insertion and deletion of web pages.

20. As to claim 64, **Ball** teaches wherein the graphical map includes representations of at least two of (a)-(e) (figures 3-5, 11-13, col. 2 lines 23-35, col. 5 lines 4-40, col. 9 lines 20-26, col. 10 lines 25-38). In addition, **Ball** explained more detail and function of HTMLDIFF in the Fifth International World Wide Web Conference on May 6-10, 1996, Paris, France).

21. As to claim 65, **Ball** teaches wherein the graphical map includes representations of at least three of (a)-(e) (figures 3-5, 11-13, col. 2 lines 23-35, col. 5 lines 4-40, col. 9 lines 20-26, col. 10 lines 25-38). In addition, **Ball** explained more detail and function of HTMLDIFF in the Fifth International World Wide Web Conference on May 6-10, 1996, Paris, France).

22. As to claim 66, **Ball** teaches wherein the graphical map includes representations of at least four of (a)-(e) (figures 3-5, 11-13, col. 2 lines 23-35, col. 5 lines 4-40, col. 9 lines 20-26, col. 10 lines 25-38. In addition, **Ball** explained more detail and function of HTMLDIFF in the Fifth International World Wide Web Conference on May 6-10, 1996, Paris, France).

23. As to claim 67, **Ball** teaches wherein the graphical map includes representations of all of (a)-(e) (figures 3-5, 11-13, col. 2 lines 23-35, col. 5 lines 4-40, col. 9 lines 20-26, col. 10 lines 25-38. In addition, **Ball** explained more detail and function of HTMLDIFF in the Fifth International World Wide Web Conference on May 6-10, 1996, Paris, France).

24. Claims 37-44 have similar limitations as claims 29-35, claim 46 has similar limitations as claim 29, claim 47 has similar limitations as claim 35, claim 48 has similar limitations as claim 34, claim 49 has similar limitation as claim 33, claim 50 has similar limitations as claim 30, claim 51 has similar limitations as claim 31, claim 52 has similar limitations as claim 32, claims 57-62 have similar limitations as claims 53-56, claim 68 has similar limitation as claim 29, claim 69 has similar limitations as claim 31, and claim 70 has similar limitations as claim 55; therefore, claims 37-44, 46-52, 57-62, and 68-70 are rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

25. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

26. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu Ha Nguyen, whose telephone number is (703) 305-7447. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, SPE Ayaz R. Sheikh, can be reached at (703) 305-9648.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

The fax number for art unit 2155 is (703) 305-7201.

Thu Ha Nguyen

September 19, 2002


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100